

REMARKS

After this amendment, claims 1-5, 12, 16 and 18-30 will be pending. Claim 1 has been amended. Claim 11 has been cancelled and new claims 18-30 have been added. The new claims relate to subject matter that had previously been cancelled in order to limit the number of issues for prosecution. In view of the Request for Continued Examination accompanies this amendment, the applicant desires to pursue this subject matter in the current application.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesies extended to the Applicant and his representative on January 4, 2005 in the telephonic interview. Applicant also wishes to thank the Examiner for his willingness to work with the Applicant on this case.

The preamble of claim 1 has been amended at the request of the Examiner to clarify the purpose of the method. No substantive change in the scope of the claim is intended. Claim 1 also has been amended in the last clause. The claim previously recited that sequences of mutually consecutive tuples were capable of being stored distinctly from other tuples. Now, the claim recites that sequences of mutually consecutive tuples may be stored using less storage space than other tuples. Applicant asserts that this amendment to claim 1 does not substantively change the scope of the claim, but rather helps clarify the claim.

Applicant believes that the claims are patentable over the prior art, as previously discussed with the Examiner. Namely, Bugajski does not disclose or suggest that tuples of any kind, much less mutually consecutive tuples, could be stored as a sequence. Nor does Bugajski teach or suggest the separate storage of sequences of mutually consecutive tuples from other tuples.

Applicant asserts that entry of this amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 because this amendment: (a) places the application in condition for allowance (for the reasons discussed above); (b) does not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration because the amendment amplifies issues previously discussed throughout prosecution; (c) does not add claims without deleting an appropriate number of claims and (d) places the application in better

form for appeal, should appeal be necessary. This amendment is necessary and was not earlier presented because it is made in response to discussions with the Examiner after the final rejection. Entry of this amendment is thus respectfully requested.

CONCLUSIONS

In view of Applicant's amendments and remarks, the Examiner's rejections are believed to be rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance and requests that the Examiner pass the case to issue at the earliest convenience. Should the Examiner have any question or wish to further discuss this application, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned at (248) 292-2920.

If for some reason Applicant has not requested a sufficient extension and/or has not paid a sufficient fee for this response and/or for the extension necessary to prevent the abandonment of this application, please consider this as a request for an extension for the required time period and/or authorization to charge our Deposit Account No. 50-1097 for any fee which may be due.

Date: _____

2/28/05



Christopher J. Voci
Registration No. 45,184
Dobrusin & Thennisch PC
29 W. Lawrence St., Suite 220
Pontiac, MI 48342
248-292-2920
Customer No. 25,215